

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT SEATTLE

7 MADIHA MINER,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 SAMANTHA KANNER,

11 Defendant.

CASE NO. C19-1047 JLR

ORDER AFFIRMING ORDER
DECLINING TO RECUSE

12 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's one-page Motion seeking, *inter alia*,
13 recusal of the Honorable Judge James L. Robart. Dkt. #3. Judge Robart declined to recuse
14 himself and, in accordance with this Court's Local Civil Rules, the matter was referred to the
15 Undersigned for review. Dkt. #9; LCR 3(f).

16 Plaintiff Madiha Miner moves the Court for recusal arguing that Judge Robart is biased
17 against her. The only statement she makes in her Motion concerning Judge Robart is that "all
18 of plaintiffs' cases were transferred to ONE judge named James L. Robart and this is unheard
19 of." Dkt. #3 at 1. Plaintiff describes this as "criminal activity at the United States District
20 Court here in Washington." *Id.*

21 A judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his
22 impartiality "might reasonably be questioned." 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). Federal judges also shall
23 disqualify themselves in circumstances where they have a personal bias or prejudice concerning
24

1 a party or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding. 28
2 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144, “whenever a party to any proceeding in a
3 district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the
4 matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse
5 party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear
6 such proceeding.” “[A] judge’s prior adverse ruling is not sufficient cause for recusal.” *United*
7 *States v. Studley*, 783 F.2d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 1986); *see also Taylor v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*,
8 993 F.2d 710, 712 (9th Cir. 1993) (“To warrant recusal, judicial bias must stem from an
9 extrajudicial source.”).

10 Plaintiff fails to allege any reasonable basis for recusal. It is the Court’s typical and
11 frequent practice to transfer cases dealing with related issues to a single judge to avoid
12 conflicting rulings. As detailed by Judge Robart’s Order, Plaintiff has filed or removed to this
13 court 11 cases, one of which was assigned to the Honorable John C. Coughenour, another
14 which was assigned to the Honorable Richard L. Jones, and the remainder of which are
15 assigned to Judge Robart. These circumstances alone fail to demonstrate any reasonable basis
16 to question the impartiality of Judge Robart. Accordingly, the Court finds and ORDERS that
17 Judge Robart’s Order (Dkt. #9) declining to recuse himself is AFFIRMED. The Clerk shall
18 provide a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

19 DATED this 1st day of August 2019.

20
21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24